RECEIVED GENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN Y 2 2004 IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appln. Ser. No.:	Filed:	Inventor(s):	Atty Dkt:
09/074,012	5 May 1998	S. YOSHIDA et al.	114Gi-121 (0694-121)
Title: High T	hermal Conduct	ivity Composite Magnet	ic Body
Examiner: B.D. Pianalto		Art Unit: 1762	

Mail Stop RCE Comm'r for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231-0001

VIA FACSIMILE 703-872-9311

Response Accompanying Request for Continued Examination and Petition for Extension of Time

Dear Sir:

In connection with the Notice of Appeal filed 11 September 2003, the period for response being extended two months by the following petition, Applicants file herewith a Request for Continued Examination for consideration of the following response.

Petition for Extension of Time

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a), Applicants hereby petition for a two month extension of time to 11 January in substitution of filing the brief on appeal pursuant to the Notice of Appeal filed 11 September 2003. Please charge the extension fee of \$420.00 and any fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 necessitated by this paper to Deposit Account No. 502144.

PAGE 292 * RCVD AT 1927004 3:59:06 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-94 * DWS:3728311 * CSID:2012390704 * DURATION (min-ss):03-40

02/02/2004 RWIMBUSH 00000007 502144

420.00 DA

01 FC:1252

09074012

Conclusion

As none of the cited references teaches the use of an EMI suppressor having a soft magnetic material (which material necessarity must have high losses, else nothing is suppressed), all of the rejections should be withdrawn. The present claims cannot properly be read on only a portion of a reference device (e.g., only a layer having some soft magnetic particle undefined as to losses, and optionally in combination with an electrically insulating material), and do to so must ignore the prior art "as a whole" (*Graham*) and give no weight to specific claim language that defines the claimed invention as an EMI suppressor.

2012390734

Should any of these rejections be maintained, as pertinent, the examiner is requested to explain the motivation for eliminating the hard magnetic material of Hartman, the electrically conductive (and thus EMI reflective) material of Goto, Ogawa, and Takahashi, or changing the low loss soft magnetic material of Horie into a high loss material, including in light of the lack of disclosure in all of these references of an intent to suppress EMI waves.

Respectfully submitted,

Bradley N. Ruben, Reg. No. 32,058 Bradley N. Ruben, PC

463 First St., Suite 5A Hoboken, NJ 07030-1859 201-239-0707 (fax -0734)

mail@rubenpatent.com

12 January 2004

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION - 37 CFR 1.8

I horoby certify that I have a reasonable basis that this paper, along with any referred to above, (i) ere being deposited with the United States Postal Sorvice on the date shown before with sufficient postage as fast class mat in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patoms, PO Box 1450, Abatandria, VA 22310-1450, or (ii) are being transmitted to the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office in accordance with 37 CPR § 1.6(d).

10.

SIGNATURE PLAN

09/074,012

Page 7 of 7

114GI-121

PAGE 2/12 * RCVD AT 1/12/2004 3:59:00 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXDF-IX * DNS:3720311 * CSED:2012300734 * DURATION (pinn-ss):2040